REMARKS

Under the **Detailed Action**, the Examiner objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive and suggested the following:

"ARTICLES MADE FROM POLYURETHANE DISPERSIONS".

Applicants consent to amend the Title of the invention to the Examiner's suggestion for a title descriptive of the invention.

In the specification, the Examiner objected to the informal usage of THF at page 4, line 20, as an abbreviation in the specification.

Applicants respectfully suggest that THF is a well-known informal abbreviation used by those skilled in the art for tetrahydrofuran. Furthermore, the specification as filed notes that co-owned and co-pending Application No. 10/701,317 filed November 4, 2003, hereby incorporated in its entirety, includes the definition of THF, meaning tetrahydrofuran, in paragraphs [0035] and [0036] of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0171745A1 (Application. No. 10/701,317).

Rejection under 35 USC § 112

In the claims, the Examiner objected, under 35 USC § 112, to Claims 1-7 for failing to set forth the subject matter Applicants regard as their invention.

Applicants respectfully maintain that after entry of currently amended Claim 1, now reciting an article made from a polyureaurethane aqueous dispersion and wherein the polyureaurethane comprises a THF copolymer soft segment comprising 25 to 60 percent by weight of ethylene glycol as a comonomer and an aromatic diisocyanate, that the subject matter of the invention is clearly set forth.

Rejection under 35 USC § 102(b)

In the claims, the Examiner objected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), that Claims 1-7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,998,540 (Lipkin) per reason of record.

Applicants maintain that Lipkin does not disclose each and every element as set forth in the claims currently amended, expressly or inherently.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Lipkin as using the Applicants' identical polyureaurethane dispersions.

Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the foregoing remarks the rejection of Claims 1-7 based on Lipkin is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103

In the claims, the Examiner objected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, that Claims 1-7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Anderle et al. (WO02 08327A1) in view of Applicants' admission per reason of record.

Applicants maintain that Anderle et al., in view of Applicants' admission, does not make Claims 1-7 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the reason that each and every element as set forth in the claims is neither taught nor suggested in the combination of references applied.

Claim 1 (currently amended) recites a polyureaurethane aqueous dispersion wherein the polyureaurethane comprises a THF copolymer soft segment comprising 25 to 60 percent by weight of ethylene glycol as a comonomer and an aromatic diisocyanate.

Applicants respectfully submit that the teaching of Anderle et al. relating to the substitution of polyether diols in whole or in part for the polyester diols used in the preparation of polyureaurethanes is a general teaching and not specific to the defined composition of the Applicants' THF copolymer soft segment comprising 25 to 60 percent by weight of ethylene glycol as a comonomer.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the foregoing the rejection of Claims 1-7 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Double Patenting

The Office Action provisionally rejected Applicants' Claim 1 over Claim 19 of copending U.S. Application No. 10/700,859 in view of Anderle et al. (WO0208327A1).

Applicants traverse. The abstract of Anderle et al. points to the presence of at least one plasticizer introduced during prepolymer formation or before prepolymer dispersal in water. Anderle et al. further points to the plasticizer as substantially or completely replacing organic diluents or solvents. As a result, the Anderle et al. plasticized compositions are less hazardous, typically have lower modulus and higher solids content and are useful in applications such as surgical gloves. The specification of Anderle et al. further discloses starting of page 17 and continuing throughout pages 18-23 to line 10 of page 23. The function of the plasticizer compounds, how the plasticizer is added during polymer formation, the effect of the plasticizer on various polymer compositions and how the plasticizer is chosen are clearly disclosed by Anderle et al. Furthermore, Anderle et al. disclose on page 18 at line 5 the use of plasticized polymer film compositions for gloves. One skilled in the art readily appreciates the details concerning the choice of plasticizer and properties of the

plasticized polyurethane compositions provided by Anderle et al. In short, one skilled in the art recognizes that plasticizers are vital components to the polyurethane compositions of Anderle et al. for use in applications such as surgical gloves.

In contrast to Anderle et al. the Applicant's claims do not require plasticizer to be added to the polyureaurethane polymers to make the articles and glove inventions therein recited. On page 7 of the Applicant's specification between lines 21 and 34 the films and gloves of the invention have a modulus of 100% elongation between 200 and 500 psi, allowing an easy stretch of the glove. Additionally, a "low set" is observed which means the gloves of the invention made from the polyureaurethane polymers disclosed therein return to their original shape after stretching. In summary the polyureaurethane polymer compositions employed by the Applicants in the manufacture of gloves require no plasticizer content in contrast to the compositions of Anderle et al. which contain a plasticizer.

The Office Action provisionally rejected Applicants' Claim 1 is over Claim 8 of copending U.S. Application No. 10/701,317 (published as US20040171745) in view of Anderle et al. WO0208327A1.

The Applicants traverse this rejection. The abstract of Anderle et al. points to the presence of at least one plasticizer introduced during prepolymer formation or before prepolymer dispersal in water. Anderle et al. further points to the plasticizer as substantially or completely replacing organic diluents or solvents. As a result, the Anderle et al. plasticized compositions are less hazardous, typically have lower modulus and higher solids content and are useful in applications such as surgical gloves. The specification of Anderle et al. further discloses starting of page 17 and continuing throughout pages 18-23 to line 10 of page 23. The function of the plasticizer compounds, how the plasticizer is added during polymer formation, the effect of the plasticizer on various polymer compositions and how the plasticizer is chosen are clearly disclosed by Anderle et al. Furthermore, Anderle et al. disclose on page 18 at line 5 the use of plasticized polymer film compositions for gloves. One skilled in the art readily appreciates these details concerning the choice of plasticizer and properties of the plasticized polyurethane compositions provided by Anderle et al. In short, one skilled in the art recognizes that plasticizers are vital components to the polyurethane compositions of Anderle et al. for use in applications such as surgical gloves.

In contrast to Anderle et al. the Applicant's claims do not require plasticizer to be added to the polyureaurethane polymers to make the articles and glove inventions therein recited. On page 7 of the Applicant's specification between lines 21 and 34 the films and gloves of the invention have a modulus of 100% elongation between 200 and 500 psi,

allowing an easy stretch of the glove. Additionally, a "low set" is observed which means the gloves of the invention made from the polyureaurethane polymers disclosed therein return to their original shape after stretching. In summary the polyureaurethane polymer compositions employed by the Applicants in the manufacture of gloves do not require plasticizer content in contrast to the compositions of Anderle et al. which contain a plasticizer.

Applicants respectfully request that the provisional double patenting rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

This response is meant to be a complete response to each and every rejection and objection set forth by the Examiner. For at least the reasons stated above, all claims are now in condition for allowance.

In the event any outstanding issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' undersigned representative.

A one-month extension of time is attached to this Amendment. Applicants hereby authorize the Commissioner to deduct the fees necessary to comply with this Amendment from the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 503223 (Invista North America S.à r.l).

Dated: October 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Furr, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 32,985
Telephone: (302) 683-3316
Facsimile: (302) 683-3473 3474
robert.b.furr@invista.com